

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES
(Attorney Docket № 14989US02)**

In the Application of:

Jeyhan Karaoguz, et al.

Serial No. 10/675,439

Filed: September 30, 2003

For: METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR
NETWORK STORAGE IN A MEDIA
EXCHANGE NETWORK

Examiner: Kunal N. Langhnoja

Group Art Unit: 2427

Confirmation No. 5630

Electronically filed on 09-DEC-2008

APPEAL BRIEF

Mail Stop Appeal Brief – Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This is an appeal from an Office Action dated July 30, 2008 (“Final Office Action”), in which claims 1-31 were finally rejected. The Appellant respectfully requests that the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences (“Board”) reverses the final rejection of claims 1-31 of the present application. The Appellant notes that this Appeal Brief is timely filed within the period for reply that ends on December 24, 2008.

REAL PARTY IN INTEREST
(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(i))

Broadcom Corporation, a corporation organized under the laws of the state of California, and having a place of business at 5300 California Avenue, Irvine, California 92617, has acquired the entire right, title and interest in and to the invention, the application, and any and all patents to be obtained therefor, as set forth in the Assignment recorded at Reel 014252, Frame 0816 in the PTO Assignment Search room.

RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES
(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(ii))

The Appellant is unaware of any related appeals or interferences.

STATUS OF THE CLAIMS
(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(iii))

Claims 1-31 were finally rejected. Pending claims 1-31 are the subject of this appeal.

The present application includes claims 1-31, which are pending in the present application. Claims 1-5, 7, 8, 10-15, 17, 18, 20-25, 27, 28, 30, and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0135860 ("Dureau") in view of US Patent № 7,065,778 ("Lu"). See

Final Office Action at page 2. Claims 6, 9, 16, 19, 26, and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dureau in view of Lu, further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0066084 (“Kaars”). *See id.* at page 7. The Appellant identifies claims 1-31 as the claims that are being appealed. The text of the pending claims is provided in the Claims Appendix.

STATUS OF AMENDMENTS
(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(iv))

The Appellant has not amended any claims subsequent to the final rejection of claims 1-31 mailed on July 30, 2008.

SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER
(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(v))

The invention of claim 1 is illustratively described in the Specification of the present application in, for example, “Brief Summary of the Invention” section in pages 4-6, and in Figures 1a – 2. Certain aspects of the invention may be found in a method and system for providing media in a communication network. *See* present application at p. 4, ll. 2-3. Certain aspects of the method for providing media in a communication network may comprise receiving a media file at a first home (e.g., 105 in FIG. 1a, or 143 in FIG. 1b) via the communication network (e.g., 101 or 151). *See id.* at p. 4, ll. 3-5. The media file may be received from outside the first home and a first format for the

received media file may be determined within the first home (105 or 143). *See id.* at p. 4, ll. 5-7. Accordingly, the received media file may be converted from the first format to a second format that is compatible with presenting and/or playing the converted media file on a television screen within the first home. *See id.* at p. 4, ll. 7-9. In addition, the received media file may be converted from the first format to a second format compatible for one or both of presentation and/or playback on a television screen within a second home (e.g., 107 or 146) in a second geographic location. *See id.* at p. 23, ll. 21-29.

Claims 2-10 are dependent upon claim 1.

The invention of claim 11 is illustratively described in the Specification of the present application in, for example, "Brief Summary of the Invention" section in pages 4-6, and in Figures 1a – 2. Another embodiment of the invention may provide a machine-readable storage, having stored thereon, a computer program having at least one code section for providing media in a communication network. *See id.* at p. 4, ll. 26-28. The at least one code section may be executable by a machine, thereby causing the machine to perform the steps as described above for providing media in a communication network. *See id.* at p. 4, line 28 – p. 5, line 2.

Claims 12-20 are dependent upon claim 11.

The invention of claim 21 is illustratively described in the Specification of the present application in, for example, "Brief Summary of the Invention" section in pages 4-6, and in Figures 1a – 2. Certain embodiments of the system for providing media in a

communication network may comprise at least one processor that receives a media file at a first home (e.g., 105 in FIG. 1a, or 143 in FIG. 1b) via the communication network (e.g., 101 or 151). *See id.* at p. 5, ll. 3-5. The media file may be received from outside the first home. *See id.* at p. 5, ll. 5-6. The processor may determine a first format of the received media file within the first home (e.g., 105 in FIG. 1a, or 143 in FIG. 1b) and convert the received media file from the first format to a second format. *See id.* at p. 5, ll. 6-7. The second format may be compatible with presenting and/or playing the converted media file on a television screen within the first home (e.g., 105 in FIG. 1a, or 143 in FIG. 1b). *See id.* at p. 5, ll. 8-10. In addition, the second format may be compatible for one or both of presentation and/or playback on a television screen within a second home (e.g., 107 or 146) in a second geographic location.

Claims 22-31 are dependent upon claim 21.

GROUND OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL
(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(vi))

Claims 1-5, 7, 8, 10-15, 17, 18, 20-25, 27, 28, 30, and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0135860 (“Dureau”) in view of US Patent № 7,065,778 (“Lu”). Claims 6, 9, 16, 19, 26, and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dureau in view of Lu, further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0066084 (“Kaars”).

ARGUMENT
(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(vii))

In the Final Office Action, Claims 1-5, 7, 8, 10-15, 17, 18, 20-25, 27, 28, 30, and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dureau in view of Lu. Claims 6, 9, 16, 19, 26, and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dureau in view of Lu, further in view of Kaars.

I. The Proposed Combination of Dureau and Lu Does Not Render Claims 1-5, 7, 8, 10-15, 17, 18, 20-25, 27, 28, 30, and 31 Unpatentable

A. Rejection of Independent Claims 1, 11, and 21

With regard to the rejection of independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the Appellant submits that the combination of Dureau and Lu does not disclose or suggest at least the limitation of “converting within said first home, said received media file from said first format to a second format compatible for one or both of presentation and/or playback on a television screen within a second home in a second geographic location,” as recited by the Appellant in independent claim 1.

The Final Office Action states the following:

The claimed "converting within said first home, said received media file from said first format to a second format compatible for one or both of presentation and/or playback on a television screen within a second home in a second geographic location" is met in part by Dureau that discloses the converting of received data by a proxy receiver, 12, from a first format to a second format and the use of any number of receiving devices, 30A-N, including a television for the display of the transcoded data at the same geographic location (Abstract; Figs. 1,2&4; paragraphs [0012J, [0028J, & [0035-0037]).The Dureau reference is silent with

respect to the "presentation and/or playback on a television screen within a second home in a second geographic location". However, in the same field of endeavor, the Lu reference teaches the use of a personalized video recorder (PVR) in transmitting recorded media from a first geographic location to a second geographic location for viewing on display device 212 (Abstract; Figs. 2-4; col.2, lines 25-28; col.6, lines 54-58; col. 7, lines 47-53; col.9, lines -20-26; col. 10, lines 10-15, 26-38; col. 11, line 66 to col. 12, line 2; col. 13, lines 47-51; col. 14, line 65 to col. 15, line 2).

See the Final Office Action at pages 3-4. The Examiner concedes that the Dureau reference is silent with respect to the "presentation and/or playback on a television screen within a second home in a second geographic location". However, the Appellant points out that the relevant claim limitation here is **"converting within said first home ... from said first format to a second format compatible for ... presentation and/or playback ... within a second home in a second geographic location."** In other words, the important functionality is "converting" at a first geographic location from one format to another format which is used for presentation/playback at a second geographic location. The "presentation/playback" language is related to, and further clarifies, the relevant functionality of "converting", namely the converting is done "for presentation/playback." The Appellant emphasizes that **Dureau is not only silent with respect to the "presentation and/or playback on a television screen within a second home in a second geographic location", but Dureau is also silent and also does not disclose or suggest "converting within said first home ... from said first format to a second format compatible for ... presentation and/or playback ... within a second home in a second geographic location,"** as recited in Appellant's

claim 1. **In other words, Dureau does not disclose any format conversion at a first location for purposes of presentation/playback in a second location. Even if Dureau is combined with Lu, Lu would not overcome at least this deficiency.**

The Examiner relies on Lu to teach “transmitting recorded media from a first geographic location to a second geographic location.” **The Appellant respectfully disagrees as this only partially describes Dureau’s deficiencies. As explained above, Dureau is deficient in not disclosing or suggesting “converting within said first home ... from said first format to a second format compatible for ... presentation and/or playback ... within a second home in a second geographic location.”** Lu, including all the citations relied on by the Examiner, does not overcome the above stated deficiencies of Dureau.

Therefore, the combination of Dureau and Lu does not disclose or suggest at least the limitation of “converting within said first home, said received media file from said first format to a second format compatible for one or both of presentation and/or playback on a television screen within a second home in a second geographic location,” as recited by the Appellant in independent claim 1.

Accordingly, the proposed combination of Dureau and Lu does not render independent claim 1 unpatentable, and a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established. The Appellant submits that claim 1 is allowable. Independent claims 11 and 21 are similar in many respects to the method disclosed in independent claim 1, and have been rejected by the Examiner under the same rationale as that of claim 1.

Therefore, the Appellant submits that independent claims 11 and 21 are also allowable over the references cited in the Final Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to claim 1.

B. Rejection of Dependent Claims 2, 12, and 22

Claims 2, 12, and 22 depend on independent claims 1, 11, and 21, respectively. Therefore, the Appellant submits that claims 2, 12, and 22 are allowable over the references cited in the Final Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to claim 1. The Appellant also submits that Dureau-Lu does not disclose or suggest at least the limitation of “decoding and/or decrypting said received media file within said first home,” as recited by the Appellant in claim 2.

With regard to claim 2, the Final Office Action states the following at page 4:

With respect to Claim 2, the claimed "comprising one or both of decoding and/or decrypting said received media file within said first home" is met by Dureau that discloses the use of a proxy receiver, 12, within a first location, 50, in de-multiplexing a multiplexed data signal received via a digital satellite transmission to obtain a compressed television program and/or interactive applications in it (Fig.4; paragraphs [0028] & [0036-0038]).

The Appellant would like to point out that even though Dureau discloses, at the above citations, that the proxy receiver 12 may de-multiplex a multiplexed data signal received via a digital satellite transmission, Dureau clearly does not disclose or suggest decoding and/or decrypting of received media file within the first home, as recited by the

Appellant in claim 2. Accordingly, the Appellant submits that claim 2 is allowable over the references cited in the Final Office Action at least for the above reasons.

Claims 12 and 22 are similar in many respects to the method disclosed in claim 2, and have been rejected by the Examiner under the same rationale as that of claim 2. Therefore, the Appellant submits that independent claims 12 and 22 are also allowable over the references cited in the Final Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to claim 2.

The Appellant also reserves the right to argue additional reasons beyond those set forth above to support the allowability of claim 2, 12, and 22.

C. Rejection of Dependent Claims 3, 13, and 23

Claims 3, 13, and 23 depend on independent claims 1, 11, and 21, respectively. Therefore, the Appellant submits that claims 3, 13, and 23 are allowable over the references cited in the Final Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to claim 1. The Appellant also submits that Dureau-Lu does not disclose or suggest at least the limitation of “transcoding said received media file within said first home from said first format to said second format,” as recited by the Appellant in claim 3.

With regard to claim 3, the Final Office Action states the following at pages 4-5:

With respect to Claim 3, the claimed 'comprising transcoding said received media file within said first home from said first format to said second format' is met by Dureau that discloses the transcoding of

received data by a proxy receiver, 12, from a first format to a second format within a first location, 50 (Abstract; Figs. 1, 2 & 4; paragraphs [0012], [0028], & [0035-0037]).

The Appellant would like to point out that the “second format” refers to a format for playback/presentation at a second geographic location. As explained above, Dureau (including the Abstract; Figs. 1, 2 & 4; paragraphs [0012], [0028], & [0035-0037]), does not disclose any format conversion for purposes of presentation/playback in a second location. Therefore, the Appellant maintains that Dureau-Lu does not disclose or suggest at least the limitation of “transcoding said received media file within said first home from said first format to said second format,” as recited by the Appellant in claim 3. Accordingly, the Appellant submits that claim 3 is allowable over the references cited in the Final Office Action at least for the above reasons.

Claims 13 and 23 are similar in many respects to the method disclosed in claim 3, and have been rejected by the Examiner under the same rationale as that of claim 3. Therefore, the Appellant submits that independent claims 13 and 23 are also allowable over the references cited in the Final Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to claim 3.

The Appellant also reserves the right to argue additional reasons beyond those set forth above to support the allowability of claim 3, 13, and 23.

D. Rejection of Dependent Claims 4, 14, and 24

Claims 4, 14, and 24 depend on independent claims 1, 11, and 21, respectively. Therefore, the Appellant submits that claims 4, 14, and 24 are allowable over the references cited in the Final Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to claim 1. The Appellant also submits that Dureau-Lu does not disclose or suggest at least the limitation of “directly transferring said converted media file to at least one media peripheral located within said first home,” as recited by the Appellant in claim 4.

With regard to claim 4, the Final Office Action states the following at page 5:

With respect to Claim 4, the claimed "comprising directly transferring said converted media file to at least one media peripheral located within first home" is met by Dureau that discloses the transferring of the transcoded data from the proxy receiver, 12, to a number of receivers, 30A-N, which may be a set-top box (STB), a television (TV), a video cassette recorder (VCR), a personal video recorder (PVR), a personal digital assistant (PDA), a personal computer (PC) a video game console, and/or a mobile/cell phone (Fig. 1,3,&4; paragraphs [0012], 0028], [0033], [0035], [0037], & [0044]).

The Appellant would like to point out that the “converted media file” refers to a file that has been converted to a format for playback/presentation at a second geographic location. As explained above, Dureau (including Fig. 1, 3, &4; paragraphs [0012], 0028], [0033], [0035], [0037], & [0044]), does not disclose any format conversion for purposes of presentation/playback in a second location, or any direct transferring of a media file converted to a format for presentation/playback in a second location, to at least one media peripheral located within the first home. Accordingly, the Appellant

submits that claim 4 is allowable over the references cited in the Final Office Action at least for the above reasons.

Claims 14 and 24 are similar in many respects to the method disclosed in claim 4, and have been rejected by the Examiner under the same rationale as that of claim 4. Therefore, the Appellant submits that independent claims 14 and 24 are also allowable over the references cited in the Final Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to claim 4.

The Appellant also reserves the right to argue additional reasons beyond those set forth above to support the allowability of claim 4, 14, and 24.

E. Rejection of Dependent Claims 5, 15, and 25

Claims 5, 15, and 25 depend on independent claims 1, 11, and 21, respectively. Therefore, the Appellant submits that claims 5, 15, and 25 are allowable over the references cited in the Final Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to claim 1. The Appellant also submits that Dureau-Lu does not disclose or suggest at least the limitation of “distributing said converted media file to one or both of a media peripheral within said first home and/or a media peripheral within said second home via one or both of a wired and/or a wireless connection,” as recited by the Appellant in claim 5.

With regard to claim 5, the Final Office Action states the following at page 5:

With respect to Claim 5, the claimed "comprising distributing said converted media file to one or both of a media peripheral within said first home and/or a media peripheral within a second home via one or both of a wired and/or a wireless connection" is met by Dureau that discloses the use of a proxy receiver, 12, in converting received data from one format to another and distributing converted data to a number of receivers, 30A-N, via a wired/wireless connection (Abstract; Figs. 1&3; paragraphs [0033-0035] & [0037]).

The Appellant would like to point out that the "converted media file" refers to a file that has been converted to a format for playback/presentation at a second geographic location. As explained above, Dureau (including Abstract; Figs. 1&3; paragraphs [0033-0035] & [0037]), does not disclose any format conversion for purposes of presentation/playback in a second location, or any distributing of such converted media file within a first or second location. Accordingly, the Appellant submits that claim 5 is allowable over the references cited in the Final Office Action at least for the above reasons.

Claims 15 and 25 are similar in many respects to the method disclosed in claim 5, and have been rejected by the Examiner under the same rationale as that of claim 5. Therefore, the Appellant submits that independent claims 15 and 25 are also allowable over the references cited in the Final Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to claim 5.

The Appellant also reserves the right to argue additional reasons beyond those set forth above to support the allowability of claim 5, 15, and 25.

F. Rejection of Dependent Claims 7, 17, and 27

Claims 7, 17, and 27 depend on independent claims 1, 11, and 21, respectively. Therefore, the Appellant submits that claims 7, 17, and 27 are allowable over the references cited in the Final Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to claim 1. The Appellant also submits that Dureau-Lu does not disclose or suggest at least the limitation of “storing said converted media file in one or both of a network attached storage and/or a storage area network within one or both of said first home and/or said second home,” as recited by the Appellant in claim 7.

With regard to claim 7, the Final Office Action states the following at page 5:

With respect to Claim 7, the claimed "comprising storing said converted media file in one or both of a network attached storage and/or a storage area network within one or both of the first home and/or a said second home" is met by Dureau that discloses the use of a mass storage unit, 314, in storing the transcoded content (Fig. 5; paragraphs [0038], [0042] & [0043]).

The Appellant would like to point out that the “converted media file” refers to a file that has been converted to a format for playback/presentation at a second geographic location. As explained above, Dureau (including Fig. 5; paragraphs [0038], [0042] & [0043]), does not disclose any format conversion for purposes of presentation/playback in a second location, or any storing of the converted media file in a network attached storage and/or a storage area network. Accordingly, the Appellant submits that claim 7 is allowable over the references cited in the Final Office Action at least for the above reasons.

Claims 17 and 27 are similar in many respects to the method disclosed in claim 7, and have been rejected by the Examiner under the same rationale as that of claim 7. Therefore, the Appellant submits that independent claims 17 and 27 are also allowable over the references cited in the Final Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to claim 7.

The Appellant also reserves the right to argue additional reasons beyond those set forth above to support the allowability of claim 7, 17, and 27.

G. Rejection of Dependent Claims 8, 18, and 28

Claims 8, 18, and 28 depend on independent claims 1, 11, and 21, respectively. Therefore, the Appellant submits that claims 8, 18, and 28 are allowable over the references cited in the Final Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to claim 1. The Appellant also submits that Dureau-Lu does not disclose or suggest at least the limitation of "retrieving said stored converted media file," as recited by the Appellant in claim 8.

With regard to claim 8, the Final Office Action states the following at pages 5-6:

With respect to Claim 8, the claimed "comprising: retrieving said stored converted media file; and displaying on said television screen within said first home, said retrieved converted media file" is met by Dureau that discloses the storage of transcoded data in mass storage device, 314, prior to transmission, such as format 530A destined for television output (Fig. 5; paragraph [0043]).

The Appellant would like to point out that the “converted media file” refers to a file that has been converted to a format for playback/presentation at a second geographic location. As explained above, Dureau (including Fig. 5; paragraph [0043]), does not disclose any format conversion for purposes of presentation/playback in a second location, or any retrieving of stored converted media file. Accordingly, the Appellant submits that claim 8 is allowable over the references cited in the Final Office Action at least for the above reasons.

Claims 18 and 28 are similar in many respects to the method disclosed in claim 8, and have been rejected by the Examiner under the same rationale as that of claim 8. Therefore, the Appellant submits that independent claims 18 and 28 are also allowable over the references cited in the Final Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to claim 8.

The Appellant also reserves the right to argue additional reasons beyond those set forth above to support the allowability of claim 8, 18, and 28.

H. Rejection of Dependent Claims 10, 20, and 30

Claims 10, 20, and 30 depend on independent claims 1, 11, and 21, respectively. Therefore, the Appellant submits that claims 10, 20, and 30 are allowable over the references cited in the Final Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to claim 1.

The Appellant also reserves the right to argue additional reasons beyond those set forth above to support the allowability of claim 10, 20, and 30.

I. Rejection of Dependent Claim 31

Claim 31 depends on independent claim 21. Therefore, the Appellant submits that Claim 31 is allowable over the references cited in the Final Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to claim 21.

The Appellant also reserves the right to argue additional reasons beyond those set forth above to support the allowability of claim 31.

II. The Proposed Combination of Dureau, Lu and Kaars Does Not Render Claims 6, 9, 16, 19, 26, and 29 Unpatentable

A. Rejection of Dependent Claims 6, 16, and 26

Claims 6, 16, and 26 depend on independent claims 1, 11, and 21, respectively. Therefore, the Appellant submits that claims 6, 16, and 26 are allowable over the references cited in the Final Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to claim 1.

The Appellant also reserves the right to argue additional reasons beyond those set forth above to support the allowability of claim 6, 16, and 26.

B. Rejection of Dependent Claims 9, 19, and 29

Claims 9, 19, and 29 depend on independent claims 1, 11, and 21, respectively. Therefore, the Appellant submits that claims 9, 19, and 29 are allowable over the references cited in the Final Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to claim 1.

The Appellant also reserves the right to argue additional reasons beyond those set forth above to support the allowability of claim 9, 19, and 29.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, the Appellant submits that claims 1-31 are in condition for allowance. Reversal of the Examiner's rejection and issuance of a patent on the application are therefore requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge \$540 (to cover the Brief on Appeal Fee) and any additional fees or credit any overpayment to the deposit account of McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd., Account No. 13-0017.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 09-DEC-2008

By: /Ognyan I. Beremski/
Ognyan Beremski, Reg. No. 51,458
Attorney for Appellant

McANDREWS, HELD & MALLOY, LTD.
500 West Madison Street, 34th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60661
Telephone: (312) 775-8000
Facsimile: (312) 775 – 8100

(OIB)

CLAIMS APPENDIX
(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(viii))

1. A method for providing media in a communication network, the method comprising:

receiving a media file from the communication network at a first home in a first geographic location, said media file received from outside said first home;

determining within said first home, a first format of said received media file; and

converting within said first home, said received media file from said first format to a second format compatible for one or both of presentation and/or playback on a television screen within a second home in a second geographic location.

2. The method according to claim 1, comprising one or both of decoding and/or decrypting said received media file within said first home.

3. The method according to claim 1, comprising transcoding said received media file within said first home from said first format to said second format.

4. The method according to claim 1, comprising directly transferring said converted media file to at least one media peripheral located within said first home.

5. The method according to claim 1, comprising distributing said converted media file to one or both of a media peripheral within said first home and/or a media

peripheral within said second home via one or both of a wired and/or a wireless connection.

6. The method according to claim 5, comprising receiving authorization for said distributing of said converted media file to said at least one media peripheral within said second home.

7. The method according to claim 1, comprising storing said converted media file in one or both of a network attached storage and/or a storage area network within one or both of said first home and/or said second home.

8. The method according to claim 7, comprising:
retrieving said stored converted media file; and
displaying on said television screen within said first home, said retrieved converted media file.

9. The method according to claim 1, comprising storing said received media file prior to said converting in one or more of a network attached storage, a storage server and/or a storage area network located at said first home.

10. The method according to claim 1, wherein said received media file is one or more of audio, video, image, graphical and/or textual media file.

11. A machine-readable storage having stored thereon, a computer program having at least one code section for providing media in a communication network, the at least one code section being executable by a machine for causing the machine to perform steps as described above in the method.

receiving a media file from the communication network at a first home in a first geographic location, said media file received from outside said first home;

determining within said first home, a first format of said received media file; and

converting within said first home, said received media file from said first format to a second format compatible for one or both of presentation and/or playback on a television screen within a second home in a second geographic location.

12. The machine-readable storage according to claim 11, comprising one or both of code for decoding and/or code for decrypting said received media file within said first home.

13. The machine-readable storage according to claim 11, comprising code for transcoding said received media file within said first home from said first format to said second format.

14. The machine-readable storage according to claim 11, comprising code for directly transferring said converted media file to at least one media peripheral located within said first home.

15. The machine-readable storage according to claim 11, comprising code for distributing said converted media file to one or both of a media peripheral within said first home and/or a media peripheral within [[a]]said second home via at least one of a wired and a wireless connection.

16. The machine-readable storage according to claim 15, comprising code for receiving authorization for said distributing of said converted media file to said at least one media peripheral within said second home.

17. The machine-readable storage according to claim 11, comprising code for causing said converted media file to be stored in one or both of a network attached storage and/or a storage area network within one or both of said first home and/or said second home.

18. The machine-readable storage according to claim 17, comprising:
code for retrieving said stored converted media file; and
code for displaying on said television screen within said first home, said retrieved converted media file.

19. The machine-readable storage according to claim 11, comprising code for storing said received media file prior to said converting in one or more of a network attached storage, a storage server and/or a storage area network located at said first home.

20. The machine-readable storage according to claim 11, wherein said received media file is one or more of audio, video, image, graphical and/or textual media file.

21. A system for providing media in a communication network, the system comprising:

at least one processor that receives a media file from the communication network at a first home in a first geographic location, said media file received from outside said first home;

said processor determines within said first home, a first format of said received media file; and

said processor converts within said first home, said received media file from said first format to a second format compatible for one or both of presentation and/or playback on a television screen within a second home in a second geographic location.

22. The system according to claim 21, wherein said at least one processor one or both of decodes and/or decrypts said received media file within said first home.

23. The system according to claim 21, wherein said at least one processor transcodes said received media file within said first home from said first format to said second format.

24. The system according to claim 21, wherein said at least one processor directly transfers said converted media file to at least one media peripheral located within said first home.

25. The system according to claim 21, wherein said at least one processor distributes said converted media file to one or both of a media peripheral within said first home and/or a media peripheral within said second home via one or both of a wired and/or a wireless connection.

26. The system according to claim 25, wherein said at least one processor receives authorization for said distributing of said converted media file to said at least one media peripheral within said second home.

27. The system according to claim 21, wherein said at least one processor stores said converted media file in one or both of a network attached storage and/or a storage area network within one or both of said first home and/or said second home.

28. The system according to claim 27, wherein said at least one processor:
retrieves said stored converted media file; and
causes said retrieved converted media file to be displayed on said television screen within said first home.

29. The system according to claim 21, wherein said at least one processor stores said received media file prior to said converting in one or more of a network attached storage, a storage server and/or a storage area network located at said first home.

30. The system according to claim 21, wherein said received media file is one or more of audio, video, image, graphical and/or textual media file.

31. The system according to claim 21, wherein said at least one processor is one or more of a media processing system processor, a media management system processor, a computer processor, a media exchange software processor and/or a media peripheral processor.

EVIDENCE APPENDIX
(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(ix))

- (1) United States Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0135860 (“Dureau”), entered into record by the Examiner in the January 4, 2008 Office Action.
- (2) United States Patent No. 7,065,778 (“Lu”), entered into record by the Examiner in the July 30, 2008 Office Action.
- (3) United States Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0066084 (“Kaars”), entered into record by the Examiner in the January 4, 2008 Office Action.

RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX
(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(x))

The Appellant is unaware of any related appeals or interferences.